

CRITICISMS ON

Christian Science.

A CONSIDERATION OF THE ABOVE THEME

IN THE
LIGHT OF HISTORY, COMMON-SENSE
AND THE BIBLE.

BY

WILLIAM RILANCE,

Methodist Minister of the Montreal Conference, Canada.

Author of "D. L. Moody vs. Henry Varley, at the World's Fair, on The Nature of Christ's Atonement"; also, A Reply to Mr. Varley's World's Fair addresses on "Christ's Coming Kingdom, or Second Adventism."

TORONTO:

WILLIAM BRIGGS,

C. W. COATES, Montreal.

S. F. HUESTIS, Halifax.

1894.

Price 20 Cents.

10 Cents

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

LIBRARY ARCHIVES

EX LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



BX
6955
R57
1894

2350933

CRITICISMS
ON
CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

A CONSIDERATION OF THE ABOVE THEME

IN THE
LIGHT OF HISTORY, COMMON-SENSE
AND THE BIBLE.

BY

WILLIAM RILANCE,

Methodist Minister of the Montreal Conference, Canada.

Author of "D. L. Moody vs. Henry Varley, at the World's Fair, on The Nature of Christ's Atonement"; also, A Reply to Mr. Varley's World's Fair addresses on "Christ's Coming Kingdom, or Second Adventism."



TORONTO :

WILLIAM BRIGGS,

C. W. COATES, Montreal.

S. F. HUESTIS, Halifax.

1894.

Entered, according to the Act of the Parliament of Canada, in the year one thousand eight hundred and ninety-four, by WILLIAM BRIGGS, Toronto, at the Department of Agriculture, Ottawa.

UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA LIBRARY

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

REASONS WHY I WRITE: Section 1. Trouble at Dunham, P.Q. ; Sec. 2. Agreement with True Science ; Sec. 3. Benefits of Discussion - - - - -	PAGE 5-8
--	-------------

CHAPTER II.

WHAT IS PANTHEISM?—Section 1. Views of Chambers ; Sec. 2. Views of Krauth ; Sec. 3. Views of Hopkins ; Sec. 4. Views of Lanphear ; Sec. 5. Two Schools of (1) Eleatic, (2) Ionic ; Sec. 6. Is Christian Science Pantheism - - - - -	9-11
---	------

CHAPTER III.

IS GOD A PERSONAL BEING?—Section 1. Hegel and Mrs. Eddy Agree ; Sec. 2. Evidence that Mrs. Eddy Teaches Pantheism ; Sec. 3. Dr. Pope on Divine Personality -	12-14
--	-------

CHAPTER IV.

WHY DO THEY REJECT THE SACRAMENT?—Section 1. Reject the Humanity of Christ ; Sec. 2. Reproof by St. John ; Sec. 3. How Arius and Apollinaris Differ ; Sec. 4. How Mrs. Eddy Quotes Scripture - - - - -	15-18
---	-------

CHAPTER V.

IS THERE PERSONALITY IN MAN?—Section 1. Mrs. Eddy Protests ; Sec. 2. View of Dr. Badgley ; Sec. 3. Appeal to Reason ; Sec. 4. View of Sir W. Hamilton -	19-21
---	-------

CHAPTER VI.

IS MAN'S BODY MATERIAL?—Section 1. Mrs. Eddy's View ; Sec. 2. What is a Phantom ? Sec. 3. Difference between Mind and Matter ; Sec. 4. In what did Image of God Consist? - - - - -	22-25
---	-------

21-64
2350933

CHAPTER VII.

	PAGE
DISEASE AND HEALING : Section 1. Can Man be Sick ? Sec.	
2. Did Job have Boils or only Illusions ? Sec. 3. Are	
Fresh Air and Cleanliness any Good ? - - - -	26-29

CHAPTER VIII.

SIN—WHAT IS IT?—Section 1. Is it Real? Sec. 2. Does	
Jesus Save us any Sorrow? Sec. 3. What did Christ	
come for? - - - - -	30-38

CHAPTER IX.

EVIDENCE THAT CHRISTIAN SCIENCE IS PANTHEISM FROM	
INDIA : Section 1. Views of Drs. Pope and Shaw ;	
Sec. 2. St. John's Condemnation of Sin ; Sec. 3. The	
Analogy between the two as to (1) Illusion, (2) Fear ;	
Sec. 4. All-Godism Leads to Polytheism ; Sec. 5. Two	
Monstrosities ; Conclusion - - - - -	39-48

Criticisms on Christian Science.

CHAPTER I.

REASONS FOR WRITING.

ON attending the District Meeting at Cowansville last fall (1893), I had occasion to pass through Bedford and Dunham, P.Q.

My attention was drawn by a friend to the excitement, especially at the latter place, over the "oppositions of Christian Science, falsely so called." (1 Tim. vi. 20.)

As the minds of some sincere and, I understand, highly respectable people have been troubled by it, perhaps it is well to give it a passing consideration in these chapters.

The title itself is a misnomer. It is more like "Satanic Science." This subject, like many kindred ones, as we will see before we get through the book, is venerable with age, for it existed in the days of the Apostles.

I wish to state at the beginning that we wage no war against true science, for what is the progress of science but the discovery of God's laws? And what is wisdom but their application to life? The progress of civilization is nothing more nor less than the discovery of God's laws and their application to life.

In regard to such investigators, I can say, with the late Dr. Williams, General Superintendent, "We will hold candles for them." But this Pantheistic science, who can

bear it? This sect figured conspicuously in the world in the first and the eleventh centuries, and it seems to have been trotted out lately by a lady driver, Mrs. Mary B. Eddy, of Massachusetts. She has written extensively, and the most important of her writings are before me; consequently, I am not working in the darkness of hearsay.

I was very much amused on reading the fore part of her preface of "Science and Health," at her effort to make her readers believe that there is something "new under the sun." She says: "A book is inadequate to introduce new thoughts and make them speedily understood. It is the sturdy task of the pioneer to hack the tall oak and cut the rough granite. Future ages must declare what the pioneer has accomplished." See Chap. I. of "D. L. Moody v. Henry Varley" as to antiquity of error.

We have already observed, and I am prepared to prove that her particular tenets as to God and humanity existed before and during the days of Christ. This I expect to do before I get through.

Some may question the propriety of so much ado and discussion, and that it is only advertising the views of opponents. There may be something in that if it is simply a mention of error without a refutation of it, and that on the spot. But how are we to get the wheat from the chaff without stirring up the chaff to let the wind of investigation blow it away. The old Greek author, Herodotus, wisely observes: "Unless a variety of opinions are brought before us, we have no opportunity of selection. . . . The purity of gold cannot be ascertained by a single specimen, but when we have carefully compared it with others we are able to fix on the finest ore." Of course, if we have no wheat we had better not stir up the chaff much, for a false faith is better for the nations than none at all.

But when Bible truth is wheat which has got mixed up with pagan superstition and traditions of men, let us have the wheat to live on.

As to disputed points, their free and frank discussion can only serve the cause of Scriptural truth. As Delitzsch says in his last work, published only a day or two before his death, "we do not know exactly what will be the shape and form of Biblical criticism in the twentieth century; but this we know, that out of all this debate and controversy, the Word of God will come forth better established and better grounded than ever before."*

This has been the case, and history repeats itself, *e.g.*, take the mythology of Strauss. Dr. McClintock tells us: "Replies to Strauss poured forth in a torrent; the Gospel histories were subjected to a closer criticism than ever; and to-day the public mind of Germany is nearer to an orthodox and evangelical view of their contents than it has been for almost a century.

"Besides the general impulse given by Strauss to the study of the Four Gospels, he has done theology another good service. His book has given a deadly blow to *rationalism* properly so called. Its paltry criticism and beggarly interpretations of Scripture are nowhere more effectually dissected than in his investigations of the different parts of the history and of the expositions that have been given of it. In a word, he has driven rationalism out of the field to make way for his myths; and Neander, Ebrard, and others have exploded the myths; so that nothing remains but a return to the simple, truthful interpretations which, in the main, are given by the evangelical commentators."

I am aware that Mrs. Eddy denies in her book, page 12,

* *Homiletic Review*, Vol. XX., No. 5, p. 413.

any connection with Pantheism and Gnosticism. I reply in the language of President Hopkins, that "it is not our business to judge men, but systems, and neither liberality nor charity can require us to confound these or to fail to discriminate them by sharp lines."* The same may be said of the new theology of the New England States, for they are connected.

In our discussions with Mr. Varley, we came to the touchstone of Divine truth directly. But in this case, we will endeavour to show the oneness of Mrs. Eddy's views, as expressed in "Science and Health," their acknowledged standard, with paganistic thought, consequently the incongruity of spending millions of money to convert the heathen and at the same time receive Pantheism, labelled "Christian Science," as she wants us to do. The sugar coat does not change the poison.

* "Baccalaureate Sermon," 1867.

CHAPTER II.

WHAT IS PANTHEISM ?

IT may be objected that the word Pantheism was first used in the eighteenth century, yet by usage it stands for views as old as philosophy. Though its meaning has expression in different forms of philosophy, yet it would seem to have been set forth with sufficient clearness, both in concise definition and in extended description.

Chambers tells us that "Pantheism (Gr. *pan*, all, and *theos*, God) is the name given to that system of speculation which, in its spiritual form, identifies the universe with God (a Kosmism), and in its more material form, God with the universe."*

Krauth says: "Pantheism was a word first used by Tolland to designate the monastic doctrine which identifies the totality of being with God. Not that each thing is God, but that the whole essence or substance proper is God, and the entire phenomena are the necessary phenomena of God's nature."†

President Hopkins has well said: "Modern infidelity has various forms, but the substance is that of Pantheism, and under whatever form it may manifest itself, it is sure to chill and dwarf man and disintegrate society."

In the range of metaphysics, Dr. O. T. Lanphear has given us quite an extensive exposition in the *Homiletic*

* "Encyc.," Vol VII., page 235.

† Johnson's "Encyc."

Review of the different views of Pantheistic thought. He says: "According to the mysticism of the Alexandrian School, the logos, or reason in God, is reason in man, that in the pursuit of truth, therefore, supreme authority should be ascribed to 'God within us,' and not to the Scriptures; or, according to the teaching of Cousin, in harmony with that of the Alexandrian School, that reason is not a faculty of the human soul, but is God in man, and who defines mysticism in philosophy as the belief that God may be known face to face, without anything intermediate, as in all systems of philosophy which teach the identity of God and the human soul, including that of the Brahmins and the Buddhists;* or with Schelling, that 'Deity is the whole sum of consciousness immanent in the world,'† or with Hegel, that 'the Divine consciousness is absolutely one with the advancing consciousness of mankind.‡ If thus Pantheism inheres in a variety of philosophical systems, and with such subtlety of expression that it is not always apparent until after close inspection, it all the more becomes those who desire only to know and follow Christian truth to be on their guard against its deceptions."

So, any system which ignores the Divine personality, or hinders us from saying thou to God, is Pantheistic and fatal to the Christian religion, whether the system teaches that the universe and God are identical, or the emittent theory of the Neoplatonists, that the soul of a man is a mode of God's existence, a portion of His substance, and whose destiny is absorption in the Infinite Being; all point to paganism of either a Hindoo or a Buddhist type. The Nirvana of Buddhism is not annihilation of being, but the

* "Hodge's Theol.," Vol. I., page 61; and on the whole subject.

† "Morell's Philos.," page 454.

‡ "Morell," page 477.

annihilation of individual personality, so that the being once manifest in that personality is now reabsorbed in the absolute.

There are two schools of Pantheism, as already intimated :

1. The "Eleatic," which is penetrated by a religious sentiment, and absorbs the world in God.

2. The "Ionic," which is thoroughly materialistic, and tends to absorb God in the world.

I recognize Mrs. Eddy as belonging to the former class.

I daresay there have been variations, but these ideals can be traced back for years before Christ, as we will see when I come to consider their origin.

Having thus brought before the reader's mind a view of Pantheistic thought, we will present those of Mrs. Eddy as found in her works above mentioned. We have seen that they deny the Person of God.

CHAPTER III.

IS GOD A PERSONAL BEING?

MR. HEGEL says: "God is not a person, but personality itself, i.e., the universal personality which realizes itself in every human consciousness, as so many separate thoughts of one eternal mind."*

Thus man is a part of God.

So says Mrs. Eddy. On page 378 it is recorded :

"Man was forever in God; therefore mind can never be in man, for idea was never material. Man is ideal."

Again she says: "God is mind, and there is but one mind, because there is but one God." On the preceding page she says: "God is mind. He is Divine principle, not person."

Hence, according to this theory, there is no personal God in the universe. That is Pantheistic enough.

In tract No. 12, they say: "The revelation of God as supreme destroys the childish conception of personal God, personal man and personal devil, and sickness, sin and death are then found to be illusions of a false sense of life."

If the swimming of straws is an indication which way the current runs, we may easily judge Mrs. Eddy's teaching in her book and pamphlets. The following, on page 404, speaks for itself :

* *Homiletic Review*, Vol. XIX.; No. 5; p. 403.

"The term *souls* or *spirits* is as improper as the term *gods*. Soul or Spirit * signifies Deity and nothing else."

On page 378: "God is mind, and there is but one mind, because there is but one God. Mind is deathless, limitless, eternal, and never enters the finite. Intelligence never passes into non-intelligence. Therefore, mind is never within matter; the unlimited is never limited; the eternal cannot be in the temporal, nor the immortal in mortality.

. . . Divine science shows that matter and mortal body are the illusions of human belief, which seem to appear and disappear to mortal sense alone."

Thus they make a clean sweep of everything as being more than a phantom. This will be more manifest as we pass along. I think the Socinianists, as illustrated in Chapter III. of "D. L. Moody v. Henry Varley, are breachy enough, but my! they can't

Mount aloft and soar on high
And light on nothing,

as Mrs. Eddy and her party can. We will not find anything more startling in India when, in search of the origin of this Pantheism, we arrive there. It all goes to show its parentage. On page 164: "God is love; He is therefore Divine Principal, not person."

That I am not mistaken in my diagnosis of her views, I will quote her statement as found on page 150: "One only of the following statements can be true: (1) That everything is matter; (2) that everything is Mind—which is it?" You may judge by where she puts the capital that I am correct above when I place her in the Eleatic school. I think I have established my point that

* It is a significant fact that she always deifies Soul, Spirit, Truth, etc., by putting them in capitals.

Mrs. Eddy's "Christian Science" as to God, is gross Pantheism and consequently is to be judged from that standpoint. All I need to add is that, both from Scripture and reason, we learn the vast distinction between the Creator and the created. "Elohim-Jehovah is the Scriptural doctrine expressed in symbolical names—God is the one Absolute Personality." *

* "Pope's Comp.," Vol. I., p. 253.

CHAPTER IV.

WHY DO THEY REJECT THE HUMANITY OF
CHRIST AND THE SACRAMENT OF
THE LORD'S SUPPER?

PROMINENT among their denunciations of Christianity is their abhorrence of the Lord's Supper.

In searching for the reason why they have that "abhorrence," we will understand their attitude. Like other gnostics they hold that the "Godhead of Christ was an emanation and His manhood a semblance only of man. The Divine in Him was an Æon, and the human not a material body, but a psychical or ethereal appearance that had nothing to do with the substance of the virgin."*

Thus it is apparent why they denounce the Lord's Supper. Denying the real, material body of our Lord, they join with the advocates of the "moral force theory" in their denunciation of all vicarious suffering, and, consequently, reject the emblems.

The earliest form of this Docetism was presented in the days of the Apostle John, and called forth the emphatic apostolic statement: "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God; and this is that *spirit* of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that

* "Pope's Compend.," Vol. II., p. 134.

it should come ; and even now already is it in the world." (1 John iv. 2, 3.)

Those who deny that Jesus Christ came in the flesh, *i.e.*, a real, corporeal body, are seducers—"teaching for doctrine the commandments of men"—and ought not to be listened to as having authority from God, as He is the only authority. Jesus said, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself ; handle me, and see ; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." (Luke xxiv. 39.) John tells us to "try the spirits" (or teachers). Now, there are two tests we will bring them to :

1. The one here presented by John. As I have just shown, they are : "Tekel." (Daniel v. 27.)

2. These Scientists taught that Christ, as the highest *Æon*, was suddenly sent down by the Supreme Being to rescue and reclaim *certain higher natures*, but the lowest stratum of men, the carnal and terrestrial, was irredeemably lost.

I need not detain you by any rebuttal. Every little child knows how far short the above teaching is from the Bible doctrine, *e.g.*, "Then Peter opened *his* mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons : But in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." (Acts x. 34, 35.) See also Rom. ii. 11, Gal. ii. 6, Eph. vi. 9, Col. iii. 25. The reader will notice that the views are the opposite extreme from Humanitarianism.

Here I observe the distinction between the heresies of Arius and of Apollinaris. In the former we meet with a denial of Christ's divinity, but, in the latter, a denial of His humanity. The former impairs the Godhead, but the latter the manhood of Christ. The one leads to Socinianism ; the other is the outcome of Pantheism and the legiti-

mate progenitor of the worship of rocks and stones, trees, pools, rivers, implements of trade, demons, ghosts, hobgoblins, and the whole range of idolatrous worship. This is where this abominable Christian Science business lands us. This will come up again, so I forbear more at present on this point.

In regard to the humanity of Christ, which is denied, St. Paul was very emphatic, *e.g.*, "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." (Heb. ii. 16, 17.)

This is in harmony with: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given."

There is one term which prominently presents His humanity: "For there is one God and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." (1 Tim. ii. 5.)

"But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (then saith he to the sick of the palsy,) Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house." (Matt. ix. 6.)

Now, the religion which possesses the absolute God-man is the perfect and final religion. No higher ideal of morality is possible than that furnished by the man Jesus of Nazareth. He is confessedly the very flower and perfection of humanity. No higher conception of God is possible than that which He proclaimed. And in Him the perfect love of God is incarnated in perfect human form. And no stage of communion with God, and, therefore, no religion can be higher than that in which God

gives himself to man and man gives himself to God, and in which the Christian may say, "Christ liveth in me." We find in Him a fulness and all for man.

Renan says: "If there were religion in another planet it could be no other than this. The universal triumph of Christ and Christianity is that

"One far-off Divine event,
To which the whole creation moves.'"

Perhaps I had better say for the curious that Mrs. Eddy quotes some Scripture, but every time she does so one is reminded of what Calvin said of Osiander—that when "he appeals to Scripture he corrupts as many passages as he cites."*

* "Inst.," III., 11.

God, and
in me."

er planet
iumph of

CHAPTER V.

SHE DENIES THE PERSONALITY OF MAN.

Mrs. Eddy
so one is
nat when
assages as

On page 404 she says: "There is no finite Soul or Spirit." On page 165 she says: "The science of being shows it is impossible for infinite Soul to be in finite body, and man to be a separate intelligence from his Maker."

Again, on page 378, she says: "A portion of God could not enter man, or that portion would become finite, losing the character of Deity and becoming less than God."

That is measuring the Deity by a square and compass instead of beholding the sun as a true symbol of His penetrating yet undiminished essence. You cannot measure light—much less God. How foolish, then, to talk about the impartation of the Divine Spirit to man as impairing the Godhead!

This is a contradiction, not only to Scripture as supreme, but to all true science. Her views seem to be a compound of what-not and materialism, and she contradicts herself, for certainly divisibility is a property of matter.

If man has no personality, "the remarkable family of Hegelians, begotten 'of pure nothing as mother and pure absurdity as father,' can claim a more respectable parentage than we. If man be not a personality, the voice of conscience is but the echo of a phantom judge seated upon an imaginary throne. Will-power is but the diseased and sickly vocabulary of theological superstition, priestly arro-

gance, and the misread phenomena of nature's laws that create themselves and finally shall be their own executioner. The song of our great immortality, whose discordant notes were so soon played upon the broken harps of Eden, whose strings have since been attuned to sweetest melody in the anguish of Gethsemane and the humiliation of Calvary, becomes the unharmonious voices of the elements that die away, with none to record their history or lay affection's offering upon their tomb. Life and death, an existence began and an existence closed, are but the ebb and flow of unconscious billows breaking upon the shores of eternity, and then lost and gone forever.*

Is it not recorded, "God is no respecter of persons"?

Again, has not man personal filial longings for personal parental love? Of these Pantheists it may be said:

"The world with stones instead of bread
Our hungry souls has always fed;
It promised health—in one short hour
Perished the fair and fragile flower;
It promised riches—in a day
They made them wings and fled away;
It promised friends—all sought their own,
And left my widowed heart alone."

Is it not recorded in regard to Adam, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul"?

She overlooks man's compound nature. Paul speaks about being strengthened in the inner man. Again he speaks about the two in contrast, "For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day."

* Dr. Badgley, of Belleville, Ont.

God addresses man as a person.

Man is conscious of individuality.

1. There is in me that which thinks, and I know I think.
2. There is that in me which makes choice between alternatives. I am a free agent and responsible for my actions.
3. We see man's individuality in the fact that he cannot be at once at peace and at variance with God.

4. The whole history of the race, in the fall, in redemption, in the light of a judgment, declares man's individuality.

Aristotle said: "And the thinking principle—or, at least that, rather than any other—must be considered to be each man's self."

Sir William Hamilton asks: "In what does the character of man as a moral agent consist? Man is a moral agent only as he is accountable for his actions, in other words, as he is the object of praise or blame; and this he is only inasmuch as he has prescribed to him a rule of duty, and as he is able to act, or not to act, in conformity with its precepts. The possibility of morality thus depends on the possibility of liberty; for if man be not a free agent, he is not the author of his actions, and has therefore no responsibility, no moral personality, at all."

We acknowledge that the soul is the man, but that is not the point in dispute. On page 159, she says: "There is but one I, one mind, one Spirit, because there is but one God," i.e., "Man is forever in God."

Is not that the very essence of Pantheism?

CHAPTER VI.

IS MAN'S BODY MATERIAL?

SHE denies the materiality of man's body, and indeed the existence of matter in the universe.

On page 360, she says: "All is mind; there is no matter."

On page 406, she says: "Matter is a finite illusion," and I add: "Her book is a delusion from beginning to end."

Worcester tells us that an illusion is an imagination, a deceptive appearance, a phantom. So, in the bread we eat, we are living on imagination. Take away the bread! Then what? Oh, just imagine you are strong.

The horses we drive are only a span of fine phantoms. The plow that kicks you over is only a phantom. Don't get vexed at the kick, for it is only a phantom. Come! brace up against the pain of the broken rib the kick caused, for that is only a phantom—illusion! imagination!

We have acknowledged the personality of the soul aside from the body. Hence the *ego*, I, Paul, "desire to depart and be with Christ," etc. But is there not something else in connection with my existence? I have a body with which the soul, or the *ego*, is connected. My mind reposes upon a series of material organs (the brain), but can never be resolved into those organs for it is totally unlike them, having none of those fundamentals such as extension inertia, colour, etc., we usually term material.

Here I quote from "Lee's Theology," page 257: "Matter is known to possess the properties of impenetrability, extension, figure, divisibility, indestructibility, attraction. Spirit is that which thinks, perceives, remembers, reasons, wills, and is susceptible of love, hatred, joy and grief. The former of these properties are found in our bodies in common with all other matter. The latter constitute the phenomena of the mind." And Mr. Lee adds: "It is not reasonable to suppose that properties so opposite to each other inhere in the same substance, and the only rational conclusion is that matter is not mind, and that mind is not matter."

A Christian Panthiest is a contradiction in terms.

If all is mind it is strange that the babe does not manifest intelligence at once.

There is the phenomenon of life and those of matter and mind. These three are united in one organization, but they have nothing in common.

The phenomenon of life is complete in the babe; but not so with those of matter and mind which require time for development and which are held by life in co-operation till the time of dissolution at death.

Here I refer to another of Mrs. Eddy's delusions. On page 406, she says: "Spirit is God, and man is in His image and likeness; hence man is spiritual and not material." That does not follow. Things may be alike in some properties, yet not in all. It is not logical to argue thus: The President of the United States and I both had health. I have lost mine, therefore I am not myself, but the President of the United States.

That is just as logical as that of my American cousin. Indeed, on reading her productions I have repeatedly wondered at her utter disregard for logical conclusions, a

thing we cannot afford to ignore. It makes no difference how wild the notion that takes her, she will dash down her assertions and conclusion. I suppose, however, we must be a little considerate, as all is *illusion* (?).

IMAGE OF GOD.

Mrs. Eddy says: "Man's body cannot be material; for man was made in the image of God, and God is Spirit." In what did the Divine image consist?

1. It was something that might be lost.

"And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him." (Col. iii. 10.)

Renewal implies former possession. Evidently man did not lose his body nor his soul, *i.e.*, understanding, will, reason and other intellectual faculties. It is true they were injured, but not destroyed. He retained his personality, for God asked: "Where art thou?"

2. It was something that might be regained:

"But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." (2 Cor. iii. 18.)

"Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." (Titus iii. 5.) See also Rom. xii. 2. This was the moral image of righteousness and true holiness that man lost by sin:

"And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." (Eph. iv. 24.)

Mrs. Eddy's attitude against images is a strong evidence of the paganistic origin of her views—the protest of rationalism against base image worship.

"And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things." (Rom. i. 23.)

That is the light she represents us as viewing God in, *i.e.*, material. If she would go to China or to Central Africa, she would find lots of work for her protests against image worship, and congenial ground for her sorcery of healing.

CHAPTER VII.

DISEASE AND HEALING.

WE have already intimated the whole ground of disease in her view, viz., all "illusion." On page 341 she asserts: "Man is never sick, for mind is not sick and matter cannot be." "Mind is God and therefore cannot be sick." "What is termed matter cannot be sick." (Page 293.)

Christian Science pretends to cure people by making them believe that there is no such thing as sickness, and convincing them that they are not sick.

On page 297: "You are only seeing and feeling a belief, whether it be cancer, deformity, consumption, or fracture that you deal with." "Remember that all is mind and there is no matter."

Page 301: "Speak the truth to every form of error. Tumours, ulcers, inflammation, pain, deformed back are all dream-shadows, dark images of mortal thought that will flee before the light." Thus it is all illusion, and every one could get up off a sick-bed if he only thought so; for he is well if he would only believe it.

As to the nature of a disease, we have this remarkable statement on page 339: "You say a boil is painful, but that is impossible, for matter without mind is not painful. The boil simply manifests your belief in pain, inflammation and swelling, and you call this belief a boil."

When I see Job up in heaven, I will know what he

thinks about boils—if they are only illusions and phantoms. According to the above theory, Satan hadn't much satisfaction after all, if Job had only imagined they were kisses of peace instead of boils, for "mind determines the nature of a case," says Mrs. E.

Again on page 324: "If you believe in inflamed and weak nerves, you are liable to an attack from that source. You will call it neuralgia, but I call it illusion."

Of her it may be said:

"Oh, indifference of nature
To the facts of human pain!
Every grief
That seeks relief,
Seeks it at her hand in vain."

Page 31: "All disease is the result of hallucination, and can carry its ill effects no farther than mortal mind maps out." Again, *ibid.*: "Christian Science handles the most malignant contagion with perfect assurance. . . . The Scientist who understands and adheres strictly to the rules of *my* system and rests his demonstration on its *sure basis* (italics mine), is the only safe one to employ in difficult and dangerous cases. . . . Medicine is not a science, but a bundle of speculative human theories."

On page 304, she says: "When a physician names an ailment, describes its symptoms and dangers, he commits an unconscious offence against happiness and health, and makes a sure job for himself, if not a fatal one for his patient." Why? Because it is all imagination.

The only hint at failure is found in page 328, which speaks for itself:

"Until the advancing age admits the efficacy and supremacy of mind, it is better to leave the adjustment of broken bones and dislocations to the fingers of a surgeon."

I give these numerous extracts to show that I am not accusing this person wrongfully.

"One peculiarity of Christian Science is that it positively and absolutely forbids the use of any means. No medicine, no drugs, no outward applications to the body whatever are to be allowed. The mind cures all. This is a cardinal principle. The most virulent and contagious diseases are thus to be treated without any medicine whatever."

I think we should be rather thankful to God that He has provided the healing herb, the correcting drug and the soothing poultice, which have proven so beneficial. Their non-use is an offence to Him.

I am well aware that the next quotation will be in direct opposition to this. It is only all the worse for the quotation. As to their condemnation of drugs, we have the following from page 316 :

"I account it sinful and idolatrous to have more faith in drugs, diet, air, exercise, cleanliness, than in God, Truth and Love to keep the body harmonious and make man undying."

Away with such nonsense! Has it not been proven throughout the world that just as the authorities of cities push their sanitary laws, and compel cleanliness in every part, their mortuary statistics are lowered proportionately? God has said, "They that honour me I will honour." It is no honour to God to live in filthy, closed-up and unaired rooms, etc., etc. I know the passage just quoted has a vastly more extended meaning; but surely it has the application I have made of it, on the surface, at least. "God expects every man to do his duty." "Trust in God, but keep your powder dry."

There is just one more extract I will make, for I want

to use it when I come to consider the origin of the whole thing. On page 326 we read :

"When the blood rushes through the veins, or languidly creeps along its frozen channels, we call this condition disease. This is a misconception. Fear is producing the propulsion or the languor ;" *i.e.*, fear is the great incubus. Please remember that, for it will come up again.

In regard to this whole business, I wish to make a general remark. We readily admit that mind has considerable influence over the body, and that there are many imaginary ills which may be removed by the assertion of one mind against another, or by one's own mind over itself, and it may be admitted that mental trouble often aggravates all forms of sickness ; but when this author teaches, just as she does in these words, "The utter control the mind holds over the body," she is teaching an absurdity, and one which contradicts the testimony of our senses !

CHAPTER VIII.

SIN—WHAT IS IT?

HERE we come to the most unchristian part of her book. On page 404, speaking of truth and error, she says: "One is real, the other is unreal." Page 396: "Sin should become unreal to everybody;" *i.e.*, illusionary, imaginary. On page 379, she says: "Man and God, or Principal and its ideal, are inseparable, harmonious and eternal." Again, *ibid.*: "Everything in the universe of God is His idea."

Let us examine this. That is to say that everything is harmonious with God. Could there be anything more contrary to the teachings of the Bible? Is not sin represented everywhere in the sacred page as rebellion against God, throwing off His kingly authority, destroying man's title to heaven, and bringing the curse of God upon the earth?

She contradicts herself; *e.g.*, on page 381: "Since God is omnipotent and omnipresent, there is no room for His opposite. Divine pardon destroys sin, life destroys death, truth destroys error, and love destroys hate. Being destroyed, sin needs no forgiveness."

Here is some more of her materialism.

She constantly denies the existence of matter, yet she refers to the properties which belong to matter, and not to spirit. This property is impenetrability, *i.e.*, if a barn is full of hay there is no room for oats. Again, she affirms that there is no room for God's opposite, and yet she, ever

and anon, speaks of sin, error and sickness. Oh ! I see—only illusion. That is Pantheism surely !

On page 497 : “ I cannot see that Jesus spares me one individual experience. . . . All will have the cup of sorrowful effort to drink.”

She is forgetting that Jesus saves people from their sins. If her assertions are true, the Bible is a bundle of meaningless platitudes to me.

What did Christ come for if not to save us from the cup of sorrowful effort against sin ?

What does it all mean ?

“ He is despised and rejected of men ; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief : and we hid as it were our faces from him ; he was despised, and we esteemed him not.”

“ He was taken from prison and from judgment : and who shall declare his generation ? for he was cut off out of the land of the living : for the transgression of my people was he stricken.”

“ The cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it ? ”

“ O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me : nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt.”

I ask, what does it all mean ? It means that “ He tasted death for every man.” It means that He drank the “ cup of sorrowful effort ” to spare us the sad individual effort. I see it all ! She speaks from a pagan standpoint. It has darkness without light ; night without day, etc. ; sorrow without a hope of gladness. Each one must drink it in sadness for himself. Not so, however, from a Christian standpoint.

“ Let all the Church forever bless
The Son of God, our righteousness !
Through all the world let men adore,
And tell his love on every shore.

“ O'er all the woes of life we sing,
The rising triumphs of our King,
Who sweeps the gloom of heathen night,
And shows the world his saving might.”

Again on page 330 : “ Healing the sick and reforming the sinner are one and the same thing in Christian Science.”

Looking over these statements about sin, and her denunciation of Atonement, pronouncing it all illusion and delusion, I have to say, as I said at the beginning, that the title is a misnomer.

Such statements as these dispute the very testimony of our senses, and deny certain fundamental facts of our being of which we are conscious. When a person assumes such a position as this, it is impossible to hold an argument with him, for there is no common ground to stand upon, and the only way to deal with him is simply to hold up a mirror before him in order to let the rest of the world see how really irrational he is.

To compare sin and sickness together is preposterous.

What did Christ come for? “ To seek and to save that which was lost.” What ! Lost to health of body ? No ! but of soul. We admit He healed diseases of body by His miraculous power, but what for ? To attest His Divine mission. “ Confirming the Word with signs following.” This power was rarely used, even in Bible times, *e.g.*, “ Erastus abode at Corinth : but Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick.”

If Paul had unlimited power to heal sickness, why did he leave Trophimus ?

Mrs. Eddy in her claim for success (p. 387) goes away ahead of Paul, for she claims 100 per cent. of success. All I have

to say is, the papers must tremendously belie these people if that is the case, for frequently we read of cases of failure.

All through the Bible we learn that to procure pardon of sin was the reason why He was called Jesus.

"Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter answered, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ." What for? For the healing of the body, for the stopping of pain? Nay. "Repent and be baptized in the name of Christ *for the remission of sin.*" Ah, that's it. Sin is the trouble. That's what Christ was after.

On page 309 she says: "Sin is the foundation of sickness, and you can master sin through mind."

That is a repetition of her view that sin is only an imagination, illusion, *i.e.*, imagine you are right, and you are right. Imagine that the disease of sin is cured, and it is cured.

I would rather believe the wise man who says: "There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death." (Prov. xiv. 12.)

"Tell me not, in mournful numbers,
 'Life is but an empty dream!'
 For the soul is dead that slumbers,
 And things are not what they seem."

Hence, according to Scripture and Longfellow, imagination is not all.

The God of Christianity is a Spirit—eternal, invisible and immortal. He is omnipresent, omniscient and omnipotent; He is holy, wise, just and good; He is loving, merciful, compassionate and gracious; He is the Creator of all things; He is the Preserver of all things; He is the Giver of every good and perfect gift; He is the sovereign Ruler

of the universe, working all things according to the counsel of His own will; He is good to all and His tender mercies are over all his works; He loves righteousness and hates wickedness; He has no pleasure in the death of any, but seeks to save all from sin; He is the supreme Judge; He will avenge the wicked and He will reward the righteous; He is "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty," *i.e.*, the incorrigible whom love cannot win and grace cannot save; He is a God whose righteous judgment will render to every man according to his deeds. To them who do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, He will render indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish; but to them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honour and immortality, He will give eternal life. Here is Divine Personality and also human personality. The latter is accountable to the former.

Sin is real and needs to be confessed to God—not imagined to be unreal and therefore does not exist.

It may be asked, Does not the Bible support this view that things are as we imagine, when it says, "As he thinketh in his heart so is he?" (Prov. xxiii. 7.)

Not one bit of it as far as this broad principle of right or wrong in the sight of God is concerned, *i.e.*, that wrong is right, or *vice versa*, just as man imagines. If you consider the whole passage you will find that it was spurious hospitality which was pointed out, *e.g.*, when Mrs. Jones is driving up to your house to make a visit, you say to the children, "Here comes Mrs. Jones, I wish she would stay away." But when she raps at the door she is met with a smile and a (spurious) welcome, "How do you do? I am so

glad to see you," and after tea when she is departing, there is that same deception in the remark, "Now come again, I am so glad you came to see us." But after it is all over there is the exclamation, "My ! I wish people would stay at home and not bother us so." That is the state of affairs the wise man speaks of when he says, "As he thinketh in his heart so is he : Eat and drink, saith he to thee ; but his heart is not with thee."

We see in the elements of worship as found in the human heart that man in general looks on sin as real.

Behold the adoration, awe, reverence, submission and obedience which are expressions of grief by the sinful heart, and we have abundant proof that man does not feel prepared to go before God in his own righteousness. As all the rays of the solar spectrum when blended give pure white light, so all the expressions of sorrow conjunctly give unmistakable testimony as to the reality of sin, and they prompt confession.

This is the inwrought desire of all nations mentioned in Chapter II. of "D. L. Moody v. H. Varley."

"That in even savage bosoms,
There are longings, yearnings, strivings,
For the good they comprehend not ;
That the feeble hands and helpless,
Groping blindly in the darkness,
Touch God's right hand in that darkness,
And are lifted up and strengthened."

This sense of need is natural, but just as a people are enlightened will there be an intelligent adoption of : "As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God : when shall I come and appear before God ?"

Here is a presentation of man seeking after God, who is well calculated to meet all the worshipful feeling and thought of man. God is to the heart of man what bread and water are to the body. What the ocean is to the fish, air to a bird, light to an eye, God is to humanity, the correlation of man's religious being, to believe in whom is peace, to know whom is life, to love whom is power.

But on page 396 Mrs. Eddy ignores such a thing as sin. She says: "As for sin and disease, I talk them up to talk them down; and I name them in order to unname them and show their nothingness."

It is claimed that marvellous things must be done because Christ said: "Greater works than these shall he do because I go unto the Father."

What could be greater? Why, the conversion and sanctification of sinners. That was greater. It was the turning of men from guilt and sin to the love and service of God.

When in all of Christ's ministry was there such a scene as that on the day of Pentecost, when thousands, under the preaching of Peter and the influence of the Spirit, were "pricked in their hearts," and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren what shall we do?

We imagine that we would like to have stood by and seen some of Christ's miracles, as, for example, we would like to have stood by the grave in Bethany with those sisters, and seen Lazarus come forth in his grave clothes, come forth just simply because Christ called to him. But do you know it is a greater wonder to me when God's Spirit speaks to the dead consciences of men, and awakens their souls to righteousness, and leads them to forsake sin, and to love and serve God? It is a greater work, greater

and more blessed in results, greater because it is a work that lasts eternally, greater because it manifests more clearly the marvellous compassion and love of God, greater than it would be to call back the dead to live in their bodies again for a few more years of suffering and of sorrow, and possibly of joy and of pleasure, in this world.

We have seen in all our congregations as mighty changes in the conversion of sinners as were manifested in the days of Christ in raising the dead. We see it in the conversion of Saul of Tarsus.

I had the extreme pleasure of taking into the church a few years ago, a man whose conversion was as great a miracle, as far as his life was concerned, as turning the Niagara River, by Divine power, to run westward instead of eastward.

Here are the greater works : "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them ; and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing" (Isa. xxxv. 1, 2.)

"And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills ; and all nations shall flow unto it." (Isa. ii. 2.)

"In that day shall there be upon the bells of the horses, holiness unto the Lord " (Zech. xiv. 20.)

Mrs. Eddy is just as far astray from Bible truth, though strictly in harmony with the new theology of the New England States, when she teaches probation after death.

This leads to Universalism, for of course men will get rid of their illusions and delusions then according to her view.

What is the result of such error being taught ? I have good authority for asserting the lawlessness such an error

leads up to. Men throw off Divine restraint and go head-long into sin, with the thought it will be made right in the next world. Business men have testified as to the dire results in the circles of business. But that is not the worst of it ; it ruins the eternal interests. I need not argue the point here, but it shows the pantheistic origin of Mrs. Eddy's views ; for absorption is their great cry. This brings us up to the next chapter, and may be considered an anticipation of it.

CHAPTER IX.

WHAT IS THE ORIGIN OF THIS CHRISTIAN
SCIENCE?

ON reading the New Testament one is impressed with the fact that there was an undercurrent of error, *e.g.*:

"Then certain philosophers of the Epicureans, and of the Stoicks, encountered him. And some said, What will this babbler say? other some, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods: because he preached unto them Jesus, and the resurrection." (Acts xvii. 18.)

"Avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called. (1 Tim. vi. 20.)

As to the origin of this "Christian Science, falsely so called," Chambers tells us: "It was not to be expected that the old pagan creeds and the old philosophies would expire without a struggle. They made a last stand and produced Gnosticism in the ancient world's dying hour." *

"Such a thing as theological liberalism did not appear until we find it in the form of Gnosticism, either Judaizing or anti-Judaizing, which, in an eclectic spirit, sought to combine Christian elements with eastern theosophy and Neoplatonism. Judaizing Gnosticism, Paul has occasion frequently to combat, especially in the Epistle to the Colossians." †

* See Gnostics, Chambers' "Encyclopædia."

† "Liberalism in Theology," by Rev. W. I. Shaw, D.D., Principal of Wesleyan Theological College, Montreal.

We have seen why these Scientists reject the Lord's Supper, because they deny the humanity of Christ, and also how John reproves them by saying, "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God"—is antichrist.

We have the same emphatic teaching to correct Mrs. Eddy's views that man is not a sinner, *e.g.*, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us."

Again, after telling how we may get rid of sin, viz., by confessing it to God, he repeats it to make it emphatic, for he knew that these Scientists denied that sin was more than an illusion—unreal, imaginative. Therefore he said :

"If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us," *i.e.*, God has said, "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God."

As I want to prove my accusations, I refer to her book again.

On page 31 : "Mind as far outstrips drugs in the cure of disease, *as in the cure of sin* (*italics mine*). The more excellent way is Mind Science in every case."

I will leave these two points, as to the humanity of Christ and the existence of sin, in the hands of St. John. I think if there is any wind up to these people, he has wound them up.

I wish to state, however, before leaving this Epistle of John, as to (1) the personality of God, and (2) the personality of man, the latter is to confess to the former.

If this be not correct, but we are part of God, for God is only principal, we might as well pray to ourselves, and there is no propriety in saying, "Our Father which art in heaven."

Indeed, that is her conclusion. On page 484 she says : "God is not influenced by prayer."

Again, she teaches us that prayer is *simply a thinking to ourselves*, a conjuring up to ourselves and within ourselves of longings and desires, and purposes, and not seeking to fix them upon anybody outside of ourselves.

The whole thing is blasphemous to worship the creature more than the Creator.

We asserted at the beginning, and have repeated it, and I think proven it at every turn, that it is Pantheism. We come now to consider the all-god notion as existing in India. I will take as the source of my information the Prize Essay on Missions, by Rev. George Patterson, D.D., Presbyterian minister, at New Glasgow, N.S. On page 30 he, in turn, acknowledges his indebtedness to Robinson's work on "*Hindooism in Relation to Christianity*." So there is good support for what I am about to say :

"The great central point of difference between Christianity and Hindooism lies just in this, that while the latter acknowledges a great Unity, the one Supreme Spirit, *it is not a personal God*. We have seen how the early Hindoos, after they had come to regard the separate entities of the universe as distinct divinities, still retained the idea of Unity in the Supreme. It was not a great stretch therefore from that point, to lose the finite in the infinite, to regard all existence as parts of one whole, and to merge all in the one all-prevading, all-comprising Being. At all events, the Hindoo Pantheist, setting out with the principle that out of nothing nothing can be made, not only maintains man's previous existence, but goes further, and argues that there is only one existent spirit—that the human spirit emanated from it, and must return to it. Man and God are one, Hindoos generally will say, and the great object of man should be to attain to this final absorption in the Supreme.

"If the objection be raised, that so far from our consciousness indicating any connection between us and the Supreme, it on the contrary shows limitations and imperfections, which are contradictory to the idea of God, the Hindoo replies that this is owing to delusion or *Maya*. The visible universe is but a projection of the Supreme, as the shadow is of a pillar. This enveloping us gives us the impression of our individual existence, and at the same time of a world around us, which we believe to be external to ourselves. This, however, is only as in a dream the scenes seem real, but on our awakening are seen to be illusion. Not man alone, but everything material, as well as immaterial, they regard as an outgoing of the great self-existent." (Page 30.)

How much this all sounds like the quotations we have made from "Science and Health." How can she deny the Pantheistic origin of her views?

On page 426 she says: "Reason rightly directed serves to correct the errors of sense; but while the spell of belief remains unbroken, sin, sickness and death will seem real (even as the experiences of the sleeping dream seem real) until the science of man's eternal harmony breaks this illusion with its own unbroken reality."

This *Maya* is the personification of an attribute. That is exactly what we meet with in the Puranic mythology of the Hindoos. *Maya* is the personified will or energy of the Supreme Being, who, by her, created the universe, and as in this latter doctrine the world is unreal or illusionary, *Maya* assumes the character of illusion personified.*

I presume it is on this account, viz., that *Maya* is feminine, that we find on page 444 of "Science and Health," this remarkable statement: "We have not as much

* "Chambers."

authority in Divine Science for considering God masculine as we have for considering Him feminine, for femineity gives the last (and therefore the highest) idea of Deity."

I suppose this remarkable woman will be a leader of women's rights. I have not yet come across, in her books, the reversal of 1 Cor. xi. 3, but I would not be surprised to do so at any moment. It reads as follows :

"But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ ; and the head of the woman is the man ; and the head of Christ is God."

Yes ; a complete reversal, and place woman at the head of affairs. That would not be out of the way if it is "All-God." But remember, as Mr. Patterson says : "All-God as little meets the wants of the human heart as No-God."

Here we stand on the threshold of Polytheism as found throughout the world. Instead of the thirty-three gods of the Rig-Veda, we now get a glimpse at three hundred and thirty million. Macaulay well describes this Hindooism or Pantheistic mythology : "In no part of the world has a religion ever existed more unfavourable to the moral and intellectual health of the people."

This is in harmony with what Professor Monier Williams says in regard to the effects of this All-Godism as producing fetishism : "Everything good or evil is held to be permeated by the presence of divinity. There is not an object on earth or in heaven which he is not prepared to worship—rocks, stocks and stones, trees, pools and rivers, his own implements of trade, the animals he finds most useful, the noxious reptiles he fears ; men remarkable for any extraordinary qualities—for great valour, sanctity, virtue, or even vice ; good and evil demons, ghosts and goblins, the spirits of departed ancestors, an infinite number of semi-

human, semi-divine existences—inhabitants of the seven upper and the seven lower worlds—each and all of these come in for a share of divine honour, or a tribute of more or less adoration. Verily, the Hindoo Pantheon has a place for everybody and everything. The principal deities are merely the occupants of its most conspicuous niches. To attempt an exhaustive enumeration of its minor gods and goddesses would be a hopeless task ; and to count the ever-multiplying army of its martyrs, saints and sages would be a simple impossibility. New shrines are continually springing up to receive the remains of holy men or ascetics—examples of extraordinary sanctity, or some peculiar manifestation of the divine energy, who after death are canonized and deified.”*

This is the legitimate outcome of Mrs. Eddy’s teaching. I ask this American continent : Are we willing to receive it ? It comes to us *sugar-coated* as *Christian Science*. On the authority of the Bible, I call it “Antichrist.” In regard to this one hundred per cent., infallible, metaphysical healing, which, on page 11, she claims she discovered in 1886, I have to say that if she is familiar with history, she must have known that this error too, which runs all through her book and is the texture of the whole system, is centuries old. It was common in India, China, and indeed, all of those pagan countries hundreds of years ago. It is the foundation principle of the old heathen religions of the East, and is quite familiar in the history of the Church. This is the secret charm of the heathen sorcerous men and women. They have charms prepared by witch doctors.†

* Hindooism.

† I am aware that Mrs. E. protests against this ; but I ask : Is it not the legitimate outcome of Polytheism ? And is not Polytheism the legitimate outcome of All-Godism ?

FEAR.

This is another line of argument I use, to show the ancient origin of Mrs. Eddy's views. Chambers tells us, in regard to the ancient philosophies, that "fear" was the great incubus on human happiness. We learn the same from the *Homiletic Review*, vol. xxi., No. 2: The overshadowing thought is the groaning and travailing in pain of the whole creation—the sorrows of humanity. We are willing to admit that of man as a sinner, but the difference is Christianity makes provision for the removal of man's sorrows by Him who "became a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief" for that purpose. These eastern philosophies had no such provision. Neither had Mrs. Eddy, as we saw in the last chapter. All is fear with disease and sin.

On page 297, she says: "Fear is the foundation of all disease. . . . Whatever you cherish in mortal mind is imaged forth in the body, which is the substratum of mortal mind. . . . You are only seeing and feeling a belief, whether it be cancer, deformity, consumption, or fracture that you deal with."

On page 39: "I have discerned disease in the human mind, and recognized the patient's fear of it, many weeks before the so-called disease made its appearance in the body."

How absurd! The millions of facts of people being stricken down by unthought-of diseases are a contradiction to this "fear" business.

Again, in Tract form No. 3, she says: "When one looks over the newspapers of the day, the reflection is suggested that it is dangerous to live, so loaded seems the very air with disease. These descriptions carry fear to many

minds, to be depicted in some future time upon the body. This error we can, in a great measure, counteract ; for at the prices at which our literature is now being published, we shall be able to reach many homes," *i.e.*, their literature is of more importance than the Bible, Christ, Church, etc., *ad infinitum*.

Two monstrosities in Tract form :

1. "This age seems pushing toward perfection in art, inventions and manufactures. Why, then, should religion be stereotyped, and we not obtain a more perfect and practical Christianity?"

That speaks for itself, as to the Eastern origin of her views :

"For all the Athenians and strangers which were there spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell, or to hear some new thing." (Acts xvii. 21.)

It is not elasticity of Church government she is contending for, or we could grant her that, for, as Lord King proves, we have no stereotyped form of that. God has left that to circumstances, and it matters not what your officers are called. But when she wants Christianity itself changed and perfected, I demur ; not only so, but I protest with all the powers of my being.

In the discussion with Mr. Varley we pointed out how sacredly, according to Josephus, the completed form of the Old Testament Scriptures was kept ; so with the completed form of the New.

"For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book. If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book." (Rev. xxii. 18.)

That I am not mistaken as to her meaning will appear when I consider the next monster, viz.:

2. "Jesus said I go away and come again unto you. And in this nineteenth century, once more the Spirit of Truth, Christ, the Divine Mind, appears through Christian Science."

This is another form of Adventism I overlooked when opening up the discussion with Mr. Varley.

That is too egotistical to demand a sober consideration. She is only one of thousands who have arisen from time to time, demanding such recognition.

The change she proposes is so radical, it is strange that God would leave His creatures so long without it. That fact of itself is enough to awaken suspicion. Add that to the arguments already presented, and I think we may conclude that it is found wanting.

CONCLUSION.

Thus we have given a general outline of her teaching and traced it to its Hindoo source. We have only to add some few closing remarks.

In these criticisms of "Christian Science," we have been as far apart as the poles, all the way from Alpha to Omega. There is no common ground to stand on. I said in "Moody v. Varley" that Socinianists are breachy, but the advocates of this new theology are so phantomatic that they fly.

To come together there would have to be a radical change in all our sciences, both theoretical and practical. All our treatises on chemistry, physiology and zoology of the former, and those on theology and medicine of the latter, would have to be abandoned. All our churches would have to be levelled to the ground or "Ichabod" written upon their portals. For the advocates of this new theology and the civilized parts of the world to amalgamate, I repeat it, these things are not only so, but all our theological schools would

have to be suspended, and, further, we would be left orphans; for if God is not a personal being we could no longer, with propriety, say, "Our Father," etc. In a word, Mrs. Eddy's views are a denial of all the facts of the fall, of sin, of redemption, of salvation as the Bible teaches them, of resurrection, of a judgment day, of hell and of heaven. All the great outlines of truth seem vague and unreal according to her view. If that is what she means by the return of Christ in this the nineteenth century, I reply at the risk of being called unchristian, as she is wont to do, "I have bought five yoke of oxen and I go to prove them,"—whether they be phantomatic or real—"I pray thee have me excused."

